



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/823,157	04/13/2004	Christopher Martin Lott	APP 1556	4543
9941	7590	05/18/2006	EXAMINER	
TELCORDIA TECHNOLOGIES, INC. ONE TELCORDIA DRIVE 5G116 PISCATAWAY, NJ 08854-4157			PATEL, MANGLESH M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2178	

DATE MAILED: 05/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/823,157	Applicant(s) LOTT ET AL.	
	Examiner Manglesh M. Patel	Art Unit 2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 March 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-19 and 21-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-19 and 21-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This **FINAL** action is responsive to the amendment filed on March 02, 2006.
2. Claims 1-2, 4-19 and 21-32 are pending. Claims 3 and 20 have been canceled.
Claims 1 and 19 are independent claims.

Withdrawn Objections

3. The Objection to the specification has been withdrawn.

Claim Objections

4. Claims 4 and 23 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 4 describes a method of claims 2 or 3, however since claim 3 has been canceled it should depend on claim 2, claim 23 has similar problem. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Art Unit: 2178

6. Claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-17, 19, 21-26, 30 & 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yehia (U.S. Pub 2002/0147726, filed March 20, 2002).

Regarding Independent claim 1, Yehia discloses *a method for the automatic generation of message validation and/or transformation software from message interface specifications and business rules for use in a message processing system comprising the steps of:*

- *Inputting a set of message definitions, data dictionary entries and/or business rules using a structured editor to create a set of structured files that define the message interface and/or business rules (paragraph 23 & 85, wherein an interface allows input for rules for the data and rules analysis engine that include business rules. The interface guides the user in defining the rules and rule data. The compilation component compiles the rules and rule data into an XML XSL based rule language therefore providing a set of structured files that define the message interface or business rules);*
- *Generating message validation software from the set of structured files (paragraphs 270, 272 & 279, wherein client validation and enforcing business rules at front-end applications are performed from the set of structured files represented within XML documents. The structured xml files are used to perform rule validation);*
- *Generating message transformation software from the set of structured files (paragraph 94, wherein the action processor is used with the analysis*

Art Unit: 2178

engine for processing actions pertaining to messages. Software components are developed to address the received actions and include structured files since they are described using XML).

- *Storing the message validation and transformation software in one or more databases for use by the message processing system (paragraph 279, wherein the client validation creation and distribution is stored within a database).*

Regarding Dependent claim 2, with dependency of claim 1, Yehia discloses *wherein the set of message definitions and data dictionary entries can be reused to develop additional message definitions, dictionary entries and/or business rules across an enterprise* (paragraph 92, wherein the use of XML enables maximal reuse of information and data through the composition of XML fragments. The message definitions and data dictionary entries defined within the structured files are reused because they are described using XML).

Regarding Dependent claim 4, with dependency of claim 2, Yehia discloses *wherein the structured files are in the XML format* (paragraph 22, wherein the invention uses standard XML notations to define rules and standard XSL and XSLT processing instructions to enforce rules. Therefore the structured files used to represent the business rules are described using XML).

Regarding Dependent claim 5, with dependency of claim 4, Yehia discloses *wherein the generation of message transformation software and message validation software further comprises the step of translating the structured files in the XML format into Extensible Stylesheet Language Transforms (XSLT)* (paragraph 22, wherein the invention uses standard XML notations to define rules and standard XSL and XSLT processing instructions to enforce rules. Therefore the structured XML files are translated into XSLT).

Regarding Dependent claim 6, with dependency of claim 1, Yehia discloses *wherein the step of generating message validation software further comprises the step of inputting the structured files into a schema generator in order to generate a set of W3C XML Schema to be used to validate messages* (paragraphs 97, 101 & 195 wherein the schema details the relationship between members and objects. The schema shows the relation between orders and services being ordered. The same relation is carried through the XML fragments. In addition the XML document values are mapped into the schema for validation).

Regarding Dependent claim 7, with dependency of claim 1, Yehia discloses *wherein the step of inputting further comprises the step of validating the structured files to ensure the structured files conform to a pre-determined structure* (paragraph 23, wherein the GUI guides the user in defining the rules

and rule data, therefore the structured files must conform to a pre-determined structure).

Regarding Dependent claim 9, with dependency of claim 1, Yehia discloses *wherein the structured files are presented to the user in HTML* (paragraph 138, wherein one control produces satisfactory results is scripts embedded in HTML pages. The control is used to help facilitate the negotiation process, therefore the structured files are presented to the user in HTML format to display and help guide the negotiation process).

Regarding Dependent claim 10, with dependency of claim 9, Yehia discloses *wherein the structured rule editor uses a web browser to present the HTML to the user* (paragraph 186, wherein the client connector includes only a browser based GUI that communicates directly with a web server at the hub. The GUI representing the structured rules editor uses the web browser to communicate thereby presenting the HTML to the user).

Regarding Dependent claim 11, with dependency of claim 1, Yehia discloses *producing a report detailing differences between two sets of structured files* (paragraph 130, wherein the invention checks all related contracts, verifies and analyzes the effect and alerts the member about any potential conflict. Therefore it is inherent that it identifies any differences between the structured files since it

verifies and alerts the user if differences exist between the structured files representing the contracts).

Regarding Dependent claim 12, with dependency of claim 6, Yehia discloses *modifying the structured files after generating the XML schema in order to correct errors identified by the schema generator* (paragraph 196-198 & 230, wherein a rule entity schema is used with an analysis engine to retrieve rules, rule parameters, actions and pointers. Therefore the GUI allows the user to update any errors by making changes to the rules once the rule entity schema indicates errors. A schema template is used to save the updated information).

Regarding Dependent claim 13, with dependency of claim 6, Yehia discloses *inputting the set of interface schemas into a schema validator to determine if the generated schemas are correctly formatted and consistent* (paragraphs 101 & 103, wherein the rules analyzer determines if the generated schema from the database are correctly formatted and consistent).

Regarding Dependent claim 14, Yehia discloses *modifying the structured files after validating the schema in order to correct errors identified by the schema validator* (paragraph 270, wherein the rule handler is used to validate the structured files from the schema database).

Regarding Dependent claim 15, with dependency of claim 1, Yehia discloses *transferring pre-existing word processing formatted business rule documents into structured files* (paragraph 145, wherein templates that include formatted business rules within word documents are supported by the invention).

Regarding Dependent claim 16, with dependency of claim 6, Yehia discloses *importing from existing W 3 C XML Schema files into a set of structured files* (paragraphs 92,101 &118, wherein the templates are built using XML once the data elements are extracted from the parser. The database used to store them represents the XML schema files and they are used for building contract templates according to the W3C standard).

Regarding Dependent claim 17, with dependency of claim 15, Yehia discloses

- *Translating the word processing formatted document into an XML formatted document* (paragraphs 145 & 146, wherein the word document with headers specifying the contract clause titles is translated into XML format using XSL);
- *Parsing the XML formatted document to identify unparseable constructs and errors* (paragraphs 148 & 197, wherein the parser is used to retrieve the contents of specific XML tags, those that describe the metadata of the contract. Therefore the XML document is parsed to identify unparseable constructs and errors by using the data and rules analysis engine);

- *Presenting the unparseable constructs and errors to the requirements engineer for modification* (paragraph 99, wherein the parser is used in conjunction with the rules analysis engine, therefore if unparseable constructs and errors exist they are modified via GUI that modify the rules engine);
- *Rewriting the unparseable constructs into a structured construct using the structured rule editor* (paragraphs 92 & 93, wherein the unparseable constructs identified by the rules analysis engine are modified using the GUI or structured rule editor);
- *And, repeating the parsing, presenting and rewriting steps until all unparseable constructs and errors are substantially eliminated* (paragraphs 92 & 93, wherein once the rules are modified within the GUI they are parsed again using the structured document template).

Regarding Independent claim 19, *Yehia discloses a system for the automatic generation of message validation software and/or transformation software from business rules for use in a message processing system comprising:*

- *A structured editor for inputting a set of message definitions, data dictionary entries and business rules to form a set of structured files that defines the message interface as a set of nested elements and groups of elements and business rules* (paragraph 23 & 85, wherein an interface allows input for rules for the data and rules analysis engine that include

business rules. The interface guides the user in defining the rules and rule data. The compilation component compiles the rules and rule data into an XML XSL based rule language therefore providing a set of structured files that define the message interface or business rules);

- *Means for generating message validation software and message transformation software from the structured files* (paragraph 94, 270, 272 & 279, wherein the action processor is used with the analysis engine for processing actions pertaining to messages. Software components are developed to address the received actions and include structured files since they are described using XML. Wherein client validation and enforcing business rules at front-end applications are performed from the set of structured files represented within XML documents. The structured xml files are used to perform rule validation).
- *Storage means for storing the message validation and transformation software in one or more databases for use by the message processing system* (paragraph 279, wherein the client validation creation and distribution is stored within a database).

Regarding Dependent claim 21, with dependency of claim 19, the claim is for a computer system performing the method of claim 2, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding Dependent claim 22, with dependency of claim 19, Yehia discloses *wherein the means for generating the schema inputs to message validation software from the structured files is an XML schema generator* (paragraphs 97, 101 & 195 wherein the schema details the relationship between members and objects. The schema shows the relation between orders and services being ordered. The same relation is carried through the XML fragments. In addition the XML document values are mapped into the schema for validation).

Regarding Dependent claim 23, with dependency of claim 19, the claim is for a computer system performing the method of claim 5, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding Dependent claim 24, with dependency of claim 19, Yehia discloses *wherein the structured editor comprises a means for constraining the inputs into the structured files to ensure the structured files conform to a pre-determined structure and content* (paragraph 23, wherein the GUI guides the user in defining the rules and rule data, therefore the structured files must conform to a pre-determined structure and content).

Regarding Dependent claim 25, with dependency of claim 19, Yehia discloses *wherein the structured editor comprises a graphical user interface for editing the structured files in a tabular non-XML format* (paragraph 23, wherein a structured

editor represented by a graphical user interface is used for editing the structured files that represent templates and include documents in a tabular fashion).

Regarding Dependent claim 26, with dependency of claim 24, Yehia discloses *wherein the structured editor limits the selection of attributes available to a user during definition of an element, group of elements or rule* (paragraph 23, wherein the framework determines the absence of an attribute, retrieves the rule definition, applies the rule handler, and returns the success or failure codes).

Regarding Dependent claim 30, with dependency of claim 19, Yehia discloses *wherein the structured editor is a table editor which enables the user to input tables selected from the group consisting of: Message Definition Tables, Data Dictionary Tables, Business Rule Tables, Error Tables, Variable Definition Tables, and Requirements Trace Matrix Tables* (paragraph 23, it is inherent that the structured editor is capable of supporting table inputs since it guides the user in defining the rules which are then stored within a schema database in a tabular format).

Regarding Dependent claim 32, with dependency of claim 19, Yehia discloses *compare tool for comparing a first structured file or document with a second structured file or document in order to develop a list of differences between such files or documents* (paragraph 130, wherein the invention checks all related

contracts, verifies and analyzes the effect and alerts the member about any potential conflict. Therefore it is inherent that it identifies any differences between the structured files since it verifies and alerts the user if differences exist between the structured files representing the contracts, The member is alerted when differences between the contracts exist, therefore a list showing the differences is inherently present).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 8, 18, 29 & 31 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yehia (U.S. Pub 2002/0147726, filed March 20, 2002) in view of Abrari (U.S. Pub 2002/0120917, filed Nov 26, 2001).

Regarding Dependent claim 8, with dependency of claim 1, Yehia teaches the creation and representation of business rule definitions using standard XML notation. The creation of the business rules is accomplished using a graphical user interface with a compilation component. The interface guides the user for defining the rules and data associated with the rules. However Yehia fails to explicitly teach an editor for editing structured files in a tabular format (paragraphs 21, 22 & 23). Abrari teaches *wherein the structured editor provides a*

graphical user interface to the requirements engineer for editing the structured files in a tabular format (figures 6-17, wherein a tabular format is shown within the graphical user interface for editing the structured files). Yehia and Abrari are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of development of Business rule applications. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include a tabular format within a GUI for editing structured files. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow easier updating and manipulation of programmed code by making changes within a GUI showing the code in a tabular format. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Abrari with Yehia for the benefits of allowing flexible code manipulation by changing structured files using a GUI representing code in a tabular format.

Regarding Dependent claim 18, with dependency of claim 1, Yehia fails to explicitly teach the generation of test cases for testing the business rule definitions used for message validation (paragraphs 21, 22 & 23). Abrari teaches *generating a set of test cases to provide test messages with which to test the message transformation and message validation software* (paragraph 11,47 & 42 wherein the platform separates business rules from procedural business process logic and thereby improving code quality and reducing development costs. In addition the platform enables non-technical personnel to develop, **test**, deploy and update business rules without programming. Therefore it is inherent that

testing includes generating test cases to test the message validation software).

Yehia and Abrari are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of development of Business rule applications. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the testing of the message validation software by preparing test cases.

The motivation for doing so would have been to minimize errors thereby improving code quality by testing the business rules using test messages.

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Abrari with Yehia for the benefits of allowing testing of messages for improving code quality thereby reducing development and maintenance costs.

Regarding Dependent claim 29, with dependency of claim 19, Yehia fails to teach a project interface to access all the structured files. Abrari teaches a *project interface for providing access to the user of all structured files used to define the project and access to all functions that can be performed on such files* (paragraph 42, 43 & 46 wherein building and testing involves the entire project cycle. In addition business rules developed early in the development process are incorporated into the final application. It is inherently present that the user has access to all components for the development of the project including attributes, building, testing and user interface development. This is represented by the tree view). Yehia and Abrari are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of development of Business rule applications. At the time of the

invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to allow a user to have access to all the structured files for project development. The motivation for doing so would have been to lower personnel costs and increase profits by providing an integrated and dynamic platform for application development. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Abrari with Yehia for the benefits of allowing an integrated set of tools for the development, deployment and maintenance of applications within a platform.

Regarding Dependent claim 31, with dependency of claim 19, Yehia fails to teach a document generator to develop user-readable documentation pertaining to the message definition interface and business rules. Abrari teaches a *document generator for generating user-readable documentation specifying the message definition interface and business rules* (paragraph 42, wherein the methodology guarantees that UML-conforming documentation such as case models will be created as an inherent byproduct of the software development process. Therefore a document is generated specifying the message definition interface and business rules since they are part of the application represented by the document). Yehia and Abrari are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of development of Business rule applications. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include documentation specifying the message definitions and business rules. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a more updated platform

with business rules. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Abrari with Yehia for the benefits of allowing a dynamic platform capable of generating documentation specifying business rules and message definition interface.

9. Claims 27 & 28 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yehia (U.S. Pub 2002/0147726, filed March 20, 2002) in view of Tomm (U.S. 6,560,608, filed Jun 9, 2000).

Regarding Dependent claim 27, with dependency of claim 19, Yehia teaches the creation and representation of business rule definitions using standard XML notation. The creation of the business rules is accomplished using a graphical user interface with a compilation component. The interface guides the user for defining the rules and data associated with the rules. However Yehia fails to explicitly teach the generation of an index listing of elements used in a definition (paragraphs 21, 22 & 23). Tomm teaches *means for generating an index listing of all elements used in an interface definition, cross referencing entries within data dictionaries with their appearances within message definitions* (See figure 4, column 4, lines 23-50, wherein synonyms dictionary has corresponding set of synonyms where each synonym corresponds to a data field for a given format. Therefore the index listing is part of the synonym dictionary since it relates to a data field). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include an index listing of

elements. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide mapping of data dictionaries by accessing an index listing thereby allowing rules to be more easily manipulated. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Yehia with Tomm for the benefits of eliminating the error-prone and tiresome process of entering the procedure manually each time it is needed by providing an index listing used to map dictionary data.

Regarding Dependent claim 28, with dependency of claim 19, Yehia fails to teach the use of a data dictionary capable of providing changes pertaining to only the interface definitions. Tomm teaches *means for pruning a data dictionary into a data dictionary that comprises only those elements and/or group of elements that are used in a message interface definition* (column 5, lines 25-42, wherein the rules dictionary is searched for rules matching the signature, if no rule matches an editor allows the user to create a rule. The rules or elements are defined using the editor which inherently includes removal of definitions from the dictionary or modifying the dictionary to only show elements pertaining to the message interface definition). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the removal/manipulation of rules within a data dictionary. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide rules adaptable to a target message format, thereby improving data mapping providing easier data manipulation. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Yehia with Tomm for the benefits of

providing an editor to make changes within a data dictionary for mapping target messages, thereby providing easier data manipulation and conversion between messages.

It is noted that any citation [[s]] to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. [[See, MPEP 2123]]

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filed March 2, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant states:

This is quite different from the present invention which is aimed at a system for automatically generating message validation and transformation software from rules input by a user using a structured editor. (pg 1)

The system of the present invention is significantly different in that the goal is to transform messages from a format used by one party (party A) to another format used by another party (party B). Once transformed the message can be sent to party B and the system of party B can implement the request in the message without additional processing. (pg 1)

Nothing in Yehia teaches or suggest the generation of message validation and transformation software from a set of rules input using a structured editor. (pg 2)

However the examiner respectfully disagrees. Yehia discloses the use of a user interface that allows trading partners to enter coordination rules (paragraph 76). The XSLT or XSL is used to enforce the rules or perform the validation. The use of a style

Art Unit: 2178

sheet in general is "XML Stylesheet Language for Transformations. An XSL conversion tool that defines a set of rules that **changes the structure** of an XML document into an XML document of **another structure**." (Google: Define XSLT). Applicant states that the invention is significantly different because it transforms messages from a format **A** to a different format **B**. Using the broadest reasonable interpretation including what is known in the art, a style sheet is used to convert a document from format **A** to format **B**. The editing of the contracts is done using an editor because the contracts itself can be described in word format (see paragraphs 145 and 146). However the examiner believed that the Tomm reference better addresses these points. For example claim 1, figure 3 of the Tomm reference clearly shows that the source message in a source format is converted to a target message in a target format. In addition Tomm Explicitly uses an editor to edit the structured rules (column 5, lines 25-40) Tomm states "an editor that allows the user to create a suitable rule is invoked...". As described in the specification paragraph 16, Yehia performs the same steps which involve a message in XML format and validation of that message using a style sheet. Applicant argues claim 15:

The word processing formatted documents in Yehia are contract templates that are used to enter into contracts between companies and do not represent a pre-existing database of business rules related to the validation and transformation of messages from one format to another. (pg 2)

However the examiner respectfully disagrees. Fig 27 & paragraphs 272-278 of Yehia discloses a rule & rule data repository that can be updated by a client. Applicant Argues claim 18:

Applicant submit that although testing is mentioned there is no discussion of generating a set of test messages. (pg 3)

However the examiner respectfully disagrees. Since the messages undergo validation the testing of the business rules described by Abrari inherently includes testing of messages that are directly affected by the business rules. Applicant argues claim 29:

Applicant submit that these paragraphs do not teach or suggest such a project interface but rather are concerned with the business rule input device. (pg 2)

However the examiner respectfully disagrees. Fig 7 and paragraph 46 of Abrari discloses an interface containing all the structured files (see numeral 704). Applicant argues claim 28:

Applicant submit that this section of column 5 describes the method of selecting a mapping rule using an auto-mapping process and does not teach or suggest the pruning of the data dictionary claimed in claim 28. (pg 3)

However the examiner respectfully disagrees. Tomm states “an editor that allows the user to create a suitable rule is invoked” (column 5, lines 35-36). Therefore it inherently includes the pruning or removal of definitions within the data dictionary since the user is allowed to perform the step of **editing**.

Many of the inventive features claimed and described by applicant are better addressed by the Tomm reference, however in order to expedite the prosecution of the case, those arguments are addressed within this section.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Manglesh M. Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-5937. The examiner can normally be reached on M,F 8:30-6:00 T,TH 8:30-3:00 Wed 8:30-7:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen S. Hong can be reached on (571)272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2178

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Manglesh M. Patel

Patent Examiner

May 05, 2006



CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER